R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 854 EA 001 230

VALUES AND VALUE RELATIONSHIPS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS.

BY- ROSE, GALE W.

PUB DATE FEB 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.68 15P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PRINCIPALS, *ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, *PERSONAL VALUES, ORGANIZATIONS (GROUPS), *GROUP BEHAVIOR, *TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATOR BACKGROUND, COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS, ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES, CHICAGO,

THIS DOCUMENT REPORTS STUDY OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS' VALUES, THEIR CONGRUENCE WITH TEACHER VALUES, AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO CERTAIN DEMOGRAPHIC FACTS AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS. DATA WERE OBTAINED FROM PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN 31 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS DISTRIBUTED OVER URBAN, SUBURBAN, AND RURAL AREAS OF A MIDWEST STATE. VALUES WERE MEASURED BY PRINCE'S DIFFERENTIAL VALUES INVENTORY, AND ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR WAS MEASURED ON THE SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS INVENTORY. EXAMINATION OF THE DATA RESULTED IN THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSIONS--(1) THERE ARE SUBSTANTIAL VARIATIONS ON ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR AND PERSONAL VALUES AMONG SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL PERSONNEL OF THE SAME GENERAL TYPE, AND THESE VARIATIONS OCCUR IN SOME PATTERNS OF RELATIONSHIP TO PAST AND PRESENT ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS, (2) PRINCIPALS' CHILDHOOD ENVIRONMENTS APPEAR TO BE RELATED TO PRESENT ADULT EXPRESSIONS OF VALUES, AND BOTH PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS TYPICALLY APPEAR TO LOCATE IN SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SETTINGS WHICH RELATE TO THESE BASIC VALUE SYSTEMS, AND (3) CONGRUENCE IN VALUES BETWEEN PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN THE SAME SCHOOL WAS NOT FOUND TO RELATE TO STYLES OF ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR NOR TO THE PERSONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL VARIABLES INCLUDED IN THIS STUDY. THIS PAPER WAS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY TO THE AMERICAN EDUCATION RESEARCH ASSOCIATION (CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, FEBRUARY 8-10, 1968). (HM)

ED018854

Values and Value Relationships of Elementary School Principals*

Gale W. Rose

Case Western Reserve University

It has been noted frequently that one way of understanding individual and group behavior is to know what values have entered into the action. In his analysis of the components of rational, or optimized, administrative decision-making behavior Simon[1] gave "value premises" equal weight with "factual premises" in understanding this behavior. That is, he recognized that after all the available facts are in, the decision-maker must still consider what it is "desireable" to do. Values are typically distinguished from "facts" in terms of the "is-ought" dichotomy. Researchers have been urged to keep their theoretical formulations clean by making "is" and not "ought" statements.[2] However, as noted by Thompson[3], a value concept can be taken as a variable which can exist in fact and thus be exploited in research.

A commonly cited definition of the term "value", that of Kluckhohn[4], suggests its central meaning: it is a conception of the desireable, which influences one's selection from among possible alternatives. Furthermore, the preference one exhibits is considered to be justified; it is what ought to be preferred in terms of an ultimate good. In this sense a value, a desireable end, may be distinguished from a wish or desire for any immediate gratification. Thus, the idea of "value" is accorded a central place in understanding human behavior and it would appear useful to give attention to it in our studies of educational administration. One might presume, for example, that a school administrator's

*Prepared for delivery at a session of the February 1968 meetings of the American Educational Research Association.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EA 001 230

Preferences of Principals for Instrumental and Expressive Characteristics of Teachers Related to System Type

Introduction

In a paper entitled "Characteristics of Beginning Teachers: Their Differential Linkage with School-System Types," Richard Turner offers an interesting post hoc hypothesis. He argues largely on the basis of some unanticipated empirical findings that supervisors systematically differ in the weights they assign to various teacher characteristics according to the type of school system within which the supervisor works. Specifically, he states:

> In appraising beginning teachers, the emphasis of supervisory personnel on teacher task performance...increases as the proportion of working-class to middle-class schools in the system increases, but as the proportion of working-class to middle-class schools decreases the emphasis of supervisory personnel shifts away from task performance toward an emphasis on the personal-social characteristics of the teacher.[1]

The present paper attempts to shed light on this hypothesis by reporting an investigation designed to identify the teacher characteristics which elementary principals in middle-class and working-class school systems attach the greatest importance to when predicting the success of a beginning teacher in their system. The focus on the elementary principal seems legitimate because he is the one who is nearly always responsible for the evaluation of teachers.[2]

The investigation was designed to test the following hypotheses:

1. Elementary principals in Type W school systems, in contrast to principals from Type M systems, will indicate a higher probability of success in their school systems for teachers with instrumental characteristics than for teachers with expressive

characteristics.*

2. Elementary principals in Type M school systems, in contrast to principals from Type W systems, will indicate a higher probability of success in their school systems for teachers with expressive characteristics than for teachers with instrumental characteristics.

These hypotheses are based on two assumptions which Turner maintains underlie his post hoc hypothesis cited earlier. The first is that the "criterion space" used by supervisors in appraising teaching proficiency is organized around the prevailing type of child with which their system deals and the teacher behaviors most relevant to teaching children of this type. The second is that children of working-class parents are probably both socially and intellectually more restricted than are children of middle-class parents. If these two assumptions are valid, then one should expect principals in Type W systems to place greater emphasis on teacher task performance than principals in Type M systems since the population of pupils in Type W schools finds the acquisition of intellectual skills much more difficult than children from middle-class homes. The lesser emphasis on teacher task performance in Type M systems permits the emergence of the teacher's personal-social characteristics as the dominant criterial attribute used by principals in judging the proficiency of teachers who work with middle-class children. Especially important in this kind of situation would be such teacher characteristics as the ability to maintain warm, friendly relationships

---

*For purposes of this study "instrumental" is defined as those characteristics of the teacher that are concerned primarily with how she performs the task of imparting subject matter and building the intellectual skills of students. "Expressive" refers to those characteristics of the teacher that are primarily concerned with the kind of person the teacher is and how she relates affectively to students. A "Type W" school system is a system where the pupils are drawn principally from working-class homes. A "Type M" school system is one where the pupils come primarily from middle-class homes.

with children and a favorable attitude toward pupils, both of which are valued by the middle-class in contemporary American society.

Design of the Study

Sample and Procedures

In order to test the two hypotheses, the investigator selected twelve school systems in the St. Louis metropolitan area, six Type W and six Type M. The indicator of system type was the occupation of the male residents of the community; Bureau of Census data (1960) were used to obtain this information. School systems were classified as Type W if two out of every three males were employed as craftsmen, foremen, operatives, service workers, laborers, and private household workers. Type M school systems were those in which two out of every three males were employed as professional or technical workers, managers, officials, proprietors, and clerical or sales workers.

Seventy-two elementary principals, thirty-six from each type of system, were chosen at random for inclusion in the study. Each principal was mailed two Student Teacher Evaluation Forms. One form depicted the student teacher as having strong expressive but weak instrumental characteristics while the other form portrayed the student teacher as having strong instrumental but weak expressive characteristics. No background information was supplied on the two student teachers. Rather, principals were told that both teachers were the same age, had taken similar pattern of courses, had equivalent summer work experience, and had performed satisfactorily in their academic work. Principals were further told that the two candidates had been evaluated by the same practice teaching supervi-

sor whose name was being withheld at her own request.

In a cover letter principals were informed that the Washington University Center for Educational Field Studies had been commissioned by the Placement Service to develop a "Student Teacher Evaluation Form" to be used by supervisors in reporting to school officials on the performance of student teachers. This request, subjects were told, was prompted by a survey of principals done by the Placement Service in the preceding year. The letter also mentioned that a number of principals had expressed a desire in this earlier survey for ratings of the student teacher's performance and that the enclosed ratings of the two teachers represented an effort to construct such a form. This social deception was designed to elicit a substantial return of the sample and to evoke responses not contaminated by knowledge of being involved in a research study.

Principals were asked to study the "Student Teacher Evaluation Form" for each teacher and to do the following tasks: (1) indicate on a seven-point scale the probability of success for each as a teacher (in half the cases at the primary level and in the other half at the intermediate level) in their school system, (2) indicate how helpful certain other kinds of information (e.g., pattern of courses, response to supervision, and previous work experience) would have been in making these estimates, (3) indicate which of the two persons they would more likely invite for an interview and the reason for their choice, and (4) indicate the prevailing socio-economic background of their students.

Development of the Student Teacher Evaluation Forms

In constructing the Student Teacher Evaluation Form, the author first developed a series of statements which he considered representative of either an instrumental or an expressive characteristic. These statements were derived from an analysis of actual supervisory reports found in credentials kept on file

by the Placement Office. Each hypothesized instrumental characteristic then was paired with an hypothesized expressive characteristic. In every instance pairings were made on a random basis. Fifty subjects in the University Teacher Training Program were asked to read each pair of statements carefully and to check the statement which was "expressive" using the following definition: "Expressive" deals with those characteristics of the teacher that are concerned primarily with the kind of person the teacher is and how she relates <u>affectively</u> to students. Another set of fifty subjects involved in the teacher training program was given the same statements but in different pairs. Again these statements were assigned in order on a random basis. Each subject was asked to check the statement which was indicative of an "instrumental" characteristic. "Instrumental" was used to refer to those characteristics of the teacher that are concerned primarily with how she performs the task of imparting subject matter and building the intellectual skills of students.

Those statements which were classified by subjects as being either instrumental or expressive in 90 per cent of the cases subsequently were read by another group of fifty students drawn from the graduate and undergraduate population of the Washington University education department. For each statement students were instructed to indicate on a six point scale the degree of favorability for the item. A mean favorability score was determined for each item using the judgments of the fifty respondents. This favorability score was used as the basis for selecting expressive and instrumental characteristic statements which were equivalent in their level of social desirability.

Ten statements--5 instrumental and 5 expressive--survived these two preliminary steps and were used to build two Student Teacher Evaluation Forms.

One form depicted the person as having strong instrumental but weak expressive characteristics while the other form described the student teacher as having strong expressive but weak instrumental characteristics.[3] Sample forms for both types of teachers are reproduced in Figures 1 and 2.

Insert Figures 1 and 2 here

Six different orders of the 10 statements were used. Positive evaluations were designated by a 6 (Strongly Agree) or a 5 (Agree) while negative items were assigned a 2 (Disagree) or a 3 (Disagree Somewhat). In each case three positive items received a 6 and two items a 5. Which of the items for <u>each</u> "Student Teacher Evaluation Form" were to be designated as Strongly Agree or Agree was determined on the basis of random assignment. As for the negative statements, three were designated as Disagree Somewhat and two as Disagree. Again whether an item was to receive a score of 2 or 3 was determined randomly for each evaluation form.[4]

Results

Fifty-six of the 72 principals returned usable replies, 29 from Type M systems and 27 from Type W. The findings of this investigation are based on the responses of these 56 principals.

In order to test the two basic hypotheses, a three-way analysis of variance was performed (see Tables 1 and 2) with the "probability of Success" rating assigned by principals to each teacher as the dependent variable and "System Type" (middle vs. working-class), "Teacher Type" (instrumental vs.

Washington University
Teacher Placement Service

Student Teacher Evaluation Form

Name of Student Teacher: Miss Jones

This student teacher. . .

1. Is able to enrich discussions with relevant illustrations from various sources and related fields.

1	2	3	4	5	(6)
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. Is fair, impartial, and objective in her treatment of students.

1	(2)	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. Takes good advantage of pupils' questions to further clarify ideas.

1	2	3	4	(5)	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. Has a pleasant disposition and excellent rapport with the children.

1	2	(3)	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. Commends students, gives praise freely, and is a constant source of encouragement to them.

1	2	(3)	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. Handles pupils with tact and understanding and is deeply concerned about the welfare of each child.

1	(2)	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

7. Uses a variety of texts and supplementary materials to achieve her goals.

1	2	3	4	5	(6)
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

8. Is obviously interested in pupils as human beings, is extremely cheerful and optimistic in her relationships with students, and has a good sense of humor.

1	2	(3)	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

9. Has presentations in class which show evidence of careful planning and preparation.

1	2	3	4	(5)	6
Strongly	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Strongly

1	2	3	4	5	(6)
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. Is fair, impartial, and objective in her treatment of students.

1	(2)	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. Takes good advantage of pupils' questions to further clarify ideas.

1	2	3	4	(5)	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. Has a pleasant disposition and excellent rapport with the children.

1	2	(3)	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. Commends students, gives praise freely, and is a constant source of encouragement to them.

1	2	(3)	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. Handles pupils with tact and understanding and is deeply concerned about the welfare of each child.

1	(2)	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

7. Uses a variety of texts and supplementary materials to achieve her goals.

1	2	3	4	5	(6)
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

8. Is obviously interested in pupils as human beings, is extremely cheerful and optimistic in her relationships with students, and has a good sense of humor.

1	2	(3)	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

9. Has presentations in class which show evidence of careful planning and preparation.

1	2	3	4	(5)	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

10. Uses original and relatively unique devices to aid instruction.

1	2	3	4	5	(6)
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

Figure 1-- Sample Evaluation Form for Teachers with Strong Instrumental but Weak Expressive Characteristics.

Washington University
Teacher Placement Service

Student Teacher Evaluation Form

Name of Student Teacher: Miss Smith

This student teacher. . .

1. Uses original and relatively unique devices to aid instruction.

1	(2)	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. Handles pupils with tact and understanding and is deeply concerned about the welfare of each child.

1	2	3	4	5	(6)
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. Commends students, gives praise freely, and is a constant source of encouragement to them.

1	2	3	4	(5)	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. Uses a variety of texts and supplementary materials to achieve her goals.

1	2	(3)	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. Is obviously interested in pupils as human beings, is extremely cheerful and optimistic in her relationships with students, and has a good sense of humor.

1	2	3	4	5	(6)
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. Takes good advantage of pupils' questions to further clarify ideas.

1	(2)	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

7. Has class presentations which show evidence of careful planning and preparation.

1	2	(3)	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

8. Is fair, impartial, and objective in her treatment of students.

1	2	3	4	5	(6)
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

9. Has a pleasant disposition and excellent rapport with children.

1	2	(3)	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

Disagree Somewhat Somewhat

2. Handles pupils with tact and understanding and is deeply concerned about the welfare of each child.

1	2	3	4	5	(6)
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. Commends students, gives praise freely, and is a constant source of encouragement to them.

1	2	3	4	(5)	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. Uses a variety of texts and supplementary materials to achieve her goals.

1	2	(3)	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. Is obviously interested in pupils as human beings, is extremely cheerful and optimistic in her relationships with students, and has a good sense of humor.

1	2	3	4	5	(6)
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. Takes good advantage of pupils' questions to further clarify ideas.

1	(2)	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

7. Has class presentations which show evidence of careful planning and preparation.

1	2	(3)	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

8. Is fair, impartial, and objective in her treatment of students.

1	2	3	4	5	(6)
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

9. Has a pleasant disposition and excellent rapport with children.

1	2	(3)	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

10. Is able to enrich discussions with relevant illustrations from various sources and related fields.

1	2	3	4	(5)	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree

Figure 2-- Sample Evaluation Form for Teachers with Strong Expressive but Weak Instrumental Characteristics.

expressive), and "Level Taught" (primary vs. intermediate)[5] as the independent variables of interest.

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here

Principals from Type M and Type W school systems did not differ, as hypothesized, in the probability of success ratings they assigned to teachers with instrumental as opposed to expressive characteristics. However, principals from both types of systems clearly expressed a higher probability of success for expressive type teachers than for instrumental types ($F=67.212$, $P < .001$). This was true regardless of whether the teacher was being rated as a primary or as an intermediate grade teacher. The salience of expressive teacher characteristics to elementary principals was further confirmed by an analysis of the question about which teacher would be invited for an interview. Eighty seven and a half percent of the responding principals indicated that of the two candidates they would invite the one with the strong expressive (and weak instrumental) characteristics for an interview.

Since the sample of schools included in the study might not have shared the social class characteristics of the system types from which they were drawn, an analysis was made to illuminate this possibility. The results of this analysis (see Table 3) showed that there was a substantial relationship between school socio-economic type reported by the principal[6] and system socio-economic type as indicated by census tract data ($X^2 = 31.6$; $df = 1$; $P < .001$). The sample

---

Insert Table 3 about here

TABLE 1

Comparison of Means for Teacher Probability of Success Ratings Differentiated by System Type, Teacher Type, and Level Taught

		System Type			
		Middle Class		Working Class	
Teacher Type		Instrumental	Expressive	Instrumental	Expressive
Level Taught	Primary	2.9 (n=16)	4.3 (n=16)	2.9 (n=15)	4.7 (n=15)
	Intermediate	2.3 (n=13)	4.4 (n=13)	3.1 (n=12)	4.8 (n=12)

TABLE 2

Three-Way Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Ratio
L (Level taught)	0.039	1	0.039	0.030
S (System type)	3.807	1	3.807	2.984
T (Teacher Type)	85.750	1	85.750	67.212*
LxS Interaction	1.333	1	1.333	1.045
LxT Interaction	0.653	1	0.653	0.511
SxT Interaction	0.021	1	0.021	0.016
LxSxT Interaction	0.821	1	0.821	0.644
Within Cells	132.684	104	1.276	

*Significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 3

Census Classification of System Socio-Economic Type and Principal Classification of School Socio-Economic Type Using Occupational Level as the Indicator (N = 53)*

System Socio-Economic Type by Census Data	School Socio-Economic Type Reported by Principal: Middle Class	Working Class
Middle Class	22	4
Working Class	2	25

*Three of the 56 replies were not usable.

$X^2 = 31.6$; df = 1; $P < .001$

of schools in Type W and Type M systems did differ with respect to the social class background of students as had been assumed.

Concluding Comments

In this study no empirical support could be found for the Turner hypothesis about the differential linkage of instrumental and expressive teacher characteristics to school-system types. However, under no circumstances could the present investigation be considered an attempt to replicate the Turner Study in view of the many differences between the two studies in design, procedures, and subjects.

The major conclusion warranted by this investigation is that elementary principals when considering a neophyte for a teaching position give considerably greater weight to the expressive characteristics than to the instrumental characteristics of the candidate. The reason for this is suggested by the justifications principals gave for their choice as to which candidate they would invite for an interview. The majority of respondents reasoned that the expressive characteristics of a person were stable, enduring aspects of the personality and not amenable to change. On the other hand, principals felt that weaknesses in instrumental characteristics could be corrected by informed supervision or overcome by the teacher's reliance on curriculum guides.

The author, like these principals, feels that a well formulated, carefully followed curriculum guide provides a measure of insurance against and protection from instrumental ineptitude. However, to expect that instrumental weaknesses will be improved through supervision appears to be inconsistent with current supervisory practices. According to a recent nation-wide survey of

elementary teachers conducted by the NEA,[7] the median number of observations received by this sample of teachers during a one year period was two. Furthermore, the median length of the most recent observation was 22 minutes; this observation was followed by a conference with the observer in less than half the cases. Such limited supervision when combined with the emphasis on the expressive characteristics of teachers at the time they are first hired may have important consequences for what occurs in elementary classrooms across the country. The nature and extent of these consequences might prove to be a fruitful area for further study.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Richard L. Turner, "Characteristics of Beginning Teachers: Their Different Linkage with School-System Types," School Review, 73, 1 (Spring, 1965) p. 56.

[2]"Methods of Evaluating Teachers," NEA Research Bulletin, 43, 1 (February, 1965), 12-18.

[3]In a pilot study the investigator presented information about the two types of teachers in a different format. A complete set of credentials was prepared for each type of teacher. Each set of credentials differed primarily in the recommendation of the practice teaching supervisor on the assumption that this piece of information would be given the greatest weight by the principals. One recommendation described the candidate exclusively in instrumental terms while the other was written exclusively in expressive terms. Upon analyzing the probability of success ratings assigned by principals to the instrumental and expressive type teachers, the author discovered that 17 of the 45 principals in the pilot study assigned the same success scores to both types of teachers, 22 of 45 indicated only a one point difference, and but six of the 45 specified a two or three point difference. With nearly 90 percent of these respondents reporting little or no difference in the probabilities of success for the two types of teachers, there was the possibility that when principals were given positive information about the teacher on one dimension (either instrumental or expressive) they, in the absence of information on the other dimension, inferred that this also was positive. As a consequence, both teachers would appear to be alike in their probabilities of success. If this line of reasoning were true, then the problem could be eliminated by supplying information about the person's characteristics on the second dimension. At this point the rating scale format was adopted as it permitted the investigator to furnish the respondents with positive and negative information simultaneously on the two kinds of characteristics. As expected, there clearly was a marked difference in the pattern of D scores for the two investigations ($X^2 = 31.4$; $df = 3$; $P < .001$). The D score represented the distance on the seven point scale between the probability of success scores assigned by a given principal for each type of teacher. For example, a principal who assigned a probability of success score of 5 to an expressive teacher and a score of 3 to an instrumental teacher would have a D score of 2.

[4]By assigning ratings of 6 or 5 to indicate a positive evaluation and a rating of 2 or 3 to designate a weak evaluation for a given teacher characteristic, there was the possibility that this change may have affected the social desirability of the two types of characteristics. By way of illustration, a rating of 2 or 3 for an expressive characteristic may have produced more negative affect than a comparable score for an instrumental characteristic. At the same time there was the possibility that the instrumental and expressive statements, though individually equivalent in level of social desirability, may have differed in their degree of favorability when combined into two groups of five characteri-

istics. To put this another way, the cluster of instrumental characteristics may have differed significantly in their level of social desirability from the cluster of expressive characteristics although there were no differences when the statements were considered singly. To explore these possibilities,the author prepared two Student-Teacher Evaluation Forms. Each form consisted of five statements, in one case the five instrumental items and in the other the five expressive statements. Three different orders of each group of five statements were used. The rating score pattern was identical to the one noted previously in the text and shown in Figures 1 and 2. The score for each statement was determined randomly for each evaluation. These forms were given to a group of 24 graduate students in education. Half the group received forms containing an assessment of the student teacher's instrumental characteristics while the other half was given an assessment of the candidate's expressive characteristics. Subjects were instructed to assume that they were a person responsible for employing elementary teachers and that one of the pieces of information to which they attached importance was the candidate's performance in student teaching as judged by the teacher with whom the candidate worked. Subjects also were told to study the supervisor's assessment of the candidate's performance in practice teaching and to indicate its degree of favorability by circling the appropriate number on the ten point scale. A one-way analysis of variance performed on the favorability scores for the instrumental and expressive type teachers yielded an F-ratio of less than one. The level of social desirability for the instrumental and expressive statements in the rating scale format evidently was identical.

[5]In his study Turner found support for his post hoc hypothesis for intermediate grade teachers but not for primary grade teachers. He expressed the belief that this hypothesis would hold for primary teachers as more valid task performance measures were developed for this group. Grade level was introduced into the design of the present study because of the ambiguity in the Turner data.

[6]Principals were asked to indicate the prevailing socio-economic background of their students' fathers. The social class indicator was occupation of the students' fathers. Occupations designated as either middle class or working-class were identical to the ones the author employed in arriving at system types by using census tract data.

[7]NEA Research Bulletin, op. cit.